

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 27, 32, and 33 are independent claims. Claims 1-34 stand rejected by the examiner. Assignee traverses the instant claim rejections.

Interview Summary

Assignee's representative would like to thank examiner Cam Y. T. Truong for the courtesies extended to assignee's representatives, David Bultman, Fonda Daniels, and John Biernacki during the telephone interview on January 11, 2007. The interview discussed limitations of claim 1 in the context of page 5 of the current office action and the office action's citation to figure 11 and column 2, lines 49-55 of Hara. Other limitations of claim 1 were discussed in the context of page 5 of the current office action and the office action's citation to figure 2, column 4, lines 20-35, and column 5, lines 59-65 of Hollines. The section 101 rejection was also discussed. The remarks and the amendments contained herein further summarize the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea. Assignee respectfully disagrees but to expedite prosecution of the application, assignee has amended claims 1-26 to recite a "memory" for storing information related to a B tree structure, which subject matter satisfies the statutory requirements of section 101. *See, In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031, (Fed. Cir. 1994). In view of the foregoing,

assignee submits that the instant rejection has been traversed and that the claims should proceed to issuance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-34 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Hara (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,250) in view of Hollines, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,386). Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Hollines and further in view of Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,381). Assignee traverses the instant rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended based upon the interview with the examiner. Claim 1 specifically recites (within the context of its other limitations):

- a leaf node is configured to store a first key corresponding to first data in a first data page;
- data pages store a second key and a third key;
- the second key and the third key that are stored on the data pages are duplicate keys of the first key that is stored in the leaf node

This is illustrated as a non-limiting example in figure 8 of assignee's specification, wherein a B-tree has duplicate keys on data pages. In this example, the key "42" (shown at 400) has five unique values, in other words the key "42" is duplicated multiple times (as shown at 401, 402, 403, 404, 405). Key "42" points to the data and first duplicate key 401 that are located on a data page. The first duplicate key 401 points to the next duplicate key 402 that is on a different data page, and so on.

As discussed during the interview, the cited references do not disclose such an approach as recited in claim 1, such as claim 1's limitations that a leaf node is configured to store a first key corresponding to first data in a first data page and data pages store a second key and a third key, let alone disclosing claim 1's other limitations such as the second key and the third key that are stored on the data pages being duplicate keys of the first key.

Independent claims 27, 32, and 33 have also been amended to recite the leaf page and data page configurations discussed above. Because the cited references (whether viewed alone or in combination) do not disclose such limitations of these claims, claims 27, 32, and 33 are allowable and should proceed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939